



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/601,828

06/23/2003

Guo Rui Deng

216683-114025

9067

44200

7590

09/14/2010

HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ & COHN LLP
38500 WOODWARD AVENUE
SUITE 100
BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5048

EXAMINER

DEXTER, CLARK F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3724

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/14/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/601,828	Applicant(s) DENG ET AL.	
	Examiner Clark F. Dexter	Art Unit 3724	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 June 2010.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 17-19, 33-49 and 51-76 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 33-35, 37-39, 41, 42 and 51-67 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 17-19, 36, 40, 43-49, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74 and 76 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 69, 72 and 75 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The amendment filed on June 24, 2010 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, 2nd paragraph

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 70, 73 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

In each of claims 70, 73 and 76, the recitation "means for translating a pressing force ..." is vague and indefinite as to what is being set forth, particularly as to what disclosed structure it refers.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions

covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

5. Claims 1, 17-19, 40, 43-49, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74 and 76 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827 or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827, and further in view of Beroz et al., pn 6,543,131.

Regarding claims 1, 18, 19, 40, 45-47, 49, 68, 70, 71, 73, 74 and 76, Sarka discloses an apparatus (e.g., in Fig. 11) with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention including at least one metal base portion/metal plate (e.g., 2), at least one metal blade (e.g., 15) fixedly attached to the metal base portion in the claimed manner, the at least one metal blade having at least one exposed cutting edge (e.g., 17), and a covering/housing/adaptor (e.g., 21, 22).

Sarka lacks a layer of adhesive interposed between said back surface of said at least one metal base portion and said covering. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use adhesive (e.g., two-sided adhesive tape or a

mass of adhesive material) to affix the assembly, particularly plate 2, in the fixture to facilitate assembly of the die disclosed in Sarka. One having ordinary skill in the art would be very familiar with the use of such adhesive in the assembly arts and know that it is often applied to assist in assembling of components; for example, such adhesive would be applied between the bottom plate 2 and the bottom 21 of the molding fixture to temporarily maintain the respective positions of the die components and the molding fixture during assembly, whereby after assembly, the die would be removed from the molding fixture and the adhesive removed. Beroz discloses one example of the use of such an adhesive to temporarily hold components in place during assembly (e.g., see Figs. 9, 10 and col. 7, lines 23-27; col. 15, lines 26-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to attach the covering to the metal base portion in Sarka for at least the benefits described above.

Further, Sarka lacks the specific blade configuration, specifically said at least one metal blade forming an enclosed shape. However, it is old and well known in the art to provide such blade configurations based on the desired product configuration. Phillips '933, Phillips '421 and Kang disclose just a few examples of such a blade configuration that includes an enclosed shape. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide a blade shape having any desired shape including an enclosed shape to produce the desired product.

Regarding claims 17, 43, 44 and 48, the combination teaches an apparatus (e.g., in Fig. 11) with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention but lacks the covering/housing/adaptor being made of a material softer than the metal plate,

Art Unit: 3724

specifically plastic. However, it is old and well known in the art that plastic provides various well known benefits including an inexpensive, light weight material that is easy to manufacture and handle. Further, it has been held that the selection of a known material on the basis of suitability for the intended use would be entirely obvious (see *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416 (CCPA 1960)). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to make the molding fixture disclosed in Sarka from plastic to gain the well known benefits including those described above.

6. Claim 36 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827 or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over the combination of Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550 in view of at least one of Phillips et al., pn 2,885,933 (hereafter Phillips '933), Phillips et al., pn 2,993,421 and Kang, pn 4,12,827, and further in view of Beroz et al., pn 6,543,131, and further in view of Johnson, pn 6,658,978.

The combination teaches an apparatus (e.g., in Fig. 11) with almost every structural limitation of the claimed invention but lacks the at least one metal base portion and the blade being welded together. However, it is old and well known in the art to weld a blade to a metal base portion, particularly in die structures, as being one of many known ways to provide a secure connection therebetween. Welding provides various well known advantages; for example, it is relatively inexpensive and tooling to perform such tasks is readily available. Johnson (e.g., Fig. 4) provides one example of such welding. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to

weld the at least one metal base portion and the blade being together for the well known benefits including those described above.

Allowable Subject Matter

7. Claims 69, 72 and 75 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed June 24, 2010 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

First, it is noted that applicant's presentation with respect to Sarka is acknowledged and applicant's efforts in this presentation are appreciated.

Second, it is respectfully maintained that the prior art, particularly Sarka, teaches or fairly suggests the claimed invention for at least the following reasons.

In section A of applicant's arguments, beginning on page 14 of the subject response, applicant argues that Sarka does not teach the "fixedly attaching" limitation. However, while not conceding this issue, it is respectfully submitted that this issue is moot since the rejection now includes the teaching of adding adhesive to the device of Sarka which clearly meets the limitation of fixedly attaching.

In section B of applicant's arguments, beginning on page 15 of the subject response, applicant argues that:

"If one skilled in the art were to modify Sarka to include adhesive as proposed by the Office action, Applicant submits that the modification would either: change the principle of operation or render Sarka unsatisfactory for its intended purpose; accordingly, there would be no suggestion or motivation to make the proposed modification."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's analysis. It is emphasized that the modification taught by the prior art is not a modification that is to be present during operation of the cutting device, but rather (as suggested in the prior art rejection) would be removed prior to use in an operational assembly. Thus, no change in the operation of the cutting device is contemplated or suggested.

In section C of applicant's arguments, beginning on page 16 of the subject response, applicant argues that a functional limitation must be evaluated and considered and concludes at the bottom of page 17 of the subject response that:

"Thus, in view of the above support taken directly from MPEP §2173.05(g), it is abundantly clear that the Office's position in the "Response to Arguments" section is incorrect and the function of the adhesive layer can be used to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from Sarka. Accordingly, upon fully considering and appreciating the differences in function between the claimed "layer of adhesive" and Sarka's "mold release film," the rejection should be withdrawn."

The Examiner respectfully disagrees with applicant's analysis. The Examiner acknowledges that functional recitations must be evaluated and considered and such has been done by the Examiner. However, the Examiner maintains the position that a functional recitation, wherein such a functional recitation does not clearly imply any additional structure, cannot be relied upon to patentably distinguish the claimed

invention. That is, regarding the present claimed invention, the Examiner's position is that it would be obvious to provide adhesive tape for the reasons described in the prior art rejection. The specific reason for applying such tape is not critical once a suggestion for such tape is provided.

Regarding the new claims discussed in section D of applicant's arguments beginning on page 18 of the subject response, the Examiner acknowledges and agrees with applicant's discussion regarding claims 69, 72 and 75. However, the Examiner maintains that the other new claims are met by the current rejection as follows.

In the first paragraph under section D, applicant argues that new claims 68, 71 and 74 set forth a recitation including "adhesive fixedly attaches" and states that this recitation is not intended use. However, applicant has not specified what additional structural feature(s) is/are implied by this recitation.

Similarly, in the third paragraph under section D, applicant argues that new claims 70, 73 and 76 recite "means for translating a pressing force" and states that "[T]his recitation includes alleged intended-use limitations of independent claims 1, 40 and 47 but case in means-plus-function form." However, it is again respectfully submitted that applicant has not specified what additional structural feature(s) is/are implied by this recitation.

Thus, for at least the above reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art rejections must be maintained.

Conclusion

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Clark F. Dexter whose telephone number is (571)272-4505. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Boyer D. Ashley can be reached on (571)272-4502. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3724

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

**/Clark F. Dexter/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3724**

cfd
September 13, 2010